

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1 and 6 are amended by this Amendment. Because support for the claim amendments is presented in the originally filed application (see Figures 2-3 and the paragraph bridging pages 13-14, for example), Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matter is presented.

### **Entry of Response Proper**

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended the claims in a manner believed to be responsive to the rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Claims 1-15 Recite Patentable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0068110 to Matsui et al. (Matsui) in view of U.S. Patent Number 2,219,031 to Frauenthal et al. (Frauenthal); and Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,955,476 to Murai in view of Frauenthal.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the following reason(s).

Claims 1 and 6 each recite, among other features, a cage that includes a pair of annuluses, a plurality of columns interconnecting the annuluses, and a plurality of pockets defined therein for receiving cylindrical rollers between adjacent columns, wherein each column is provided with a pair of tongues extending radially away from a base that is parallel to a corresponding annulus, and *wherein each tongue of the pair of tongues is connected to a relatively planar bottom surface disposed between the pair of tongues by an arcuate surface disposed between each tongue of the pair of tongues and an end of the relatively planar bottom surface*. See the paragraph bridging pages 13-14 and Figure 7 of the application as originally filed for an exemplary illustration of above-emphasized feature of the claimed invention.

The July 24 Response successfully argued that Matsui and Murai each fail to disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the columns of their respective cages including such features, that is, that the column (13) in Matsui and the column (2) in Murai do not have a pair of tongues extending radially away from a base that is parallel relative to an

annulus, as the instant Office Action now admits that Matsui and Murai each fail to teach a pair of tongues extending radially away from a base.

To cure the admitted deficiency of Matsui and Murai, the Office Action looks to Frauenthal. In particular, the Office Action asserts that "Frauenthal teaches a pair of tongues (14) extending radially away from a base (18) for the purpose of retaining the antifriction members against outward radial displacement. (Page 2, col 1, lines 65-73)."

Applicants note that Figure 1 of Frauenthal illustrates a web member (column) 14 having a pair of ears extending from an axially recessed portion 17 provided at a radial end of the web member 14. The axially recessed portion 17 is apparently formed by a tool that is inserted therein to spread apart the ears (page, 2, column 1, lines 65-73 of Frauenthal).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Frauenthal does not teach or suggest each ear being connected to a relatively planar bottom surface disposed between the pair of ears by an arcuate surface disposed between each ear of the pair of ear and an end of the relatively planar bottom surface. That is, while the invention recited by Claims 1 and 6 includes a tongue, an arcuate surface disposed between the tongue and an end of a bottom surface, another tongue, and another arcuate surface disposed between the other tongue and another end of the bottom surface, Frauenthal merely teaches an (as in one) arcuate surface disposed between the pair of ears.

Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider it obvious to modify the columns taught by Matsui and Murai to include the pair

of ears taught by Frauenthal because to do so would not result in the invention recited by Claims 1 and 6.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 6 are not rendered obvious in view of either one of the Matsui/Frauenthal and/or Murai/Frauenthal combinations and should be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-5 and 10-12 depend from Claim 1. Claims 7-9 and 13-15 depend from Claim 6. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reason(s) Claims 1 and 6 are allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of the Claims 1-15, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 100725.00123.**

Respectfully submitted,  
**ARENT FOX LLP**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Murat Ozgu', is written over the printed name.

Murat Ozgu  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,275

**Customer No. 004372**

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

MO/elp